

	SBC	None proposed		\$35 ongoing, \$0.04 per call for 800 number
Minnesota (7/28/02)	Qwest	Tariff	\$300.00 per point-to number established + \$30 per central office (177 sites)	None
Mississippi (7/28/02)	BellSouth	Tariff	\$389.90 per local calling area + \$150.00 per central office	None
Montana	-	-	-	-
Nebraska (7/28/02)	Qwest	Tariff	Unknown	Unknown
New Hampshire (7/24/01)	Verizon	None proposed	Unknown	Unknown
New Jersey (7/28/02)	Verizon	None proposed	Unknown	Unknown
New Mexico (7/28/02)	Qwest	Tariff	\$300.00 per point-to number + \$30.00 per central office	\$.02 per call
New York (7/28/02)	Verizon	None proposed	Unknown	Unknown
North Carolina (10/22/01)	BellSouth	Tariff	\$110.00 per switching site	None
	Sprint	Tariff	\$95.74 per central office	None
North Dakota (7/28/02)	Alltel	Tariff	\$500 per central office	-
Ohio (7/28/02)	Ameritech	None proposed	Unknown	Unknown
	Verizon	Tariff	\$116 per central office/\$495 per call center	Unknown
	Sprint	Tariff	\$115 per central office	Unknown
	Columbus Grove	Tariff	\$20 per call center/\$115 per central office	
	Orwell	Tariff	\$20 per call center/\$115 per central office	
	Frontier	None proposed	Unknown	Unknown
Oklahoma (7/28/02)	SBC	None proposed	Unknown	Unknown
Oregon (7/28/02)	Qwest	Tariff	\$300.00 per point-to number + \$95.00 per central office	\$.05 per call
Pennsylvania	Verizon	None proposed	Unknown	Unknown
	Sprint	None proposed	Unknown	Unknown
Rhode Island (7/28/02)	Verizon	None proposed	Unknown	Unknown
South Carolina (7/28/02)	BellSouth	Tariff	\$389.90 per local calling area + \$150.00 per central office	None
	ALLTEL	Tariff	\$389.90 per local calling area + \$150.00 per central office	None
South Dakota (7/28/02)	Qwest	Contract	Unknown (confidential)	Unknown (confidential)
Tennessee (7/28/02)	BellSouth	Tariff	\$30,000 setup fee	\$1,600/month MRC
Texas (7/28/02)	SBC	None proposed	\$400 per host CO for AIN	\$35 per system per month (\$875.00)
	Verizon	None proposed	\$358 per host CO for AIN	\$2.55 per call center per month (\$63.75)
	Smaller Telcos	None proposed	\$258 per CO for switch based setup	no recurring charges
Utah (7/28/02)	Qwest	Tariff	\$300.00 per point-to number + \$30.00 per central office	\$.02 per call
Vermont (7/28/02)	Verizon, etc.	None proposed	Unknown	Unknown
Virginia	Verizon	None proposed.	Unknown	Unknown
Washington (7/28/02)	Qwest	Tariff under	Unknown	Unknown

		revision		
<b>West Virginia (7/28/02)</b>	Verizon	None proposed	Unknown	Unknown
<b>Wisconsin (2/19/02)</b>	Ameritech	Tariff	\$1,550.00 per central office	\$35.00 MRC
	Century, Verizon, etc.	None proposed	Unknown	Unknown
<b>Wyoming</b>	-	-	-	-

<sup>1</sup> - The parenthetical data included with state entries denote the most recent date for which LEC cost information was available. At the time of this report, several tariffs were under consideration or revision and others were due to be filed in coming months.

<sup>2</sup> - Many LEC costs are tariffed while others are determined via individual contracts with 211 service providers.

<sup>3</sup> - Ongoing costs, when applied, may be per-call, per-minute, per-central office, or based on monthly call volume and generally are billed on a monthly basis.

### ***Wireless Access to 211***

The extreme proliferation of cellular telephones in recent years dictates that wireless access to 211 will be an increasingly important component of integrated, uniform 211 services. As well, some potential users of 211 services may find it preferable or even necessary to access 211 from outside the home. As an example, a woman facing a domestic abuse threat may not have the option of placing a 211 call to Information and Referral specialists from her home. In such cases, cellular access to 211 becomes crucial for the delivery of necessary aid.

The implementation of 211 services on wireless networks is, in some respects, different than the provision of equivalent services on wireline ("landline") telephone systems. One of the differences is that of call routing. The "base stations"/mobile switches (MSCs) used as the initial point of contact into a wireless network for a cellular telephone (the wireless equivalent of a landline network's central offices) commonly do not follow the same geographic distribution as central offices. At times, wireless calls placed from slightly different locations will be received by completely different MSCs and routed in substantially different manners. The areas covered by a wireless network are often substantially different from the areas covered by landline telephone networks (as is clear with a glance at one of the numerous coverage maps distributed by wireless providers). As well, the regions covered by *both* wireless and wireline networks can differ considerably from the established, generally political (county or state) service boundaries created by I&R service providers. This can create issues in routing calls to the appropriate call center. Should a wireless call be routed, based on the caller's current location, to the call center in closest physical proximity? The caller may be in transit and may not be best helped by that call center. Should the wireless network identify the caller's "home" area and route to the call center closest to the caller's billing address? Again, this may not be the best option to serve the caller's current need. These complexities, combined with the numerous wireless providers available in almost every geographic region (each requiring its own negotiated agreements for provision of 211 services), have led many potential and current 211 providers to concentrate on the development of 211 services over landline networks instead of wireless.

To date, six locations have successfully implemented wireless access to 211. These areas include the state of Connecticut; Minnesota (currently available in the Greater Metro Minneapolis Region but working toward statewide implementation); Knoxville, Tennessee; Montgomery, Alabama; Albuquerque, New Mexico; and Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

211 of Knoxville, Tennessee began offering wireless access to 211 services for the customers of Cricket Communications in mid-September, 2001. By July 2002, customers of US Cellular Corporation were also able to access 211. Negotiations are pending with Cingular Wireless and SunCom. Customers of Qwest can access 211 in the Greater Metro area of Minneapolis. Plans are underway to rollout this service to the entire state of Minnesota. The Volunteer and Information Center in Montgomery, Alabama, was successful in pursuing wireless access to 211. Customers of Cingular Wireless and Knology, a local cable and wireless company, can access to 211. Both companies are providing this service at no cost. In Albuquerque, New Mexico, customers of Qwest can access 211 from their cell phones. As of July 2002, customers of Sprint PCS and Unitel in that region can now access 211.

While in these cases cell phone companies worked with the local I&R agencies to provide wireless access to 211 without prolonged negotiation, Connecticut provides a

different model. United Way's Infoline 211 service in Connecticut entered into a substantial series of negotiations with the Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control (CDPUC) and the wireless industry in early 2001 which culminated in CDPUC reversing its earlier decision to exempt wireless carriers from 211 implementation requirements. In a Draft Decision dated May 1, 2001, CDPUC directed all wireless providers operating in Connecticut to provide wireless 211 access to their subscribers by August 1, 2001. Several wireless carriers in Connecticut responded to the Draft Decision, mainly stating that wireless access to 211 would be feasible within timeframes ranging from ninety days (Springwich/Cingular Wireless) to six months after the CDPUC mandate (AT&T Wireless Services). Sprint PCS, while not providing a specific timeframe for wireless implementation, "...anticipates no problems with updating its Connecticut...MSCs...to translate and route 211 calls from Sprint PCS's customers to the toll-free number provided by (Infoline)," (see **Appendix A** for more information). As of July 2002, customers of AT&T and Sprint PCS can access 211.

Connecticut's Infoline has experienced relatively few problems with wireless implementation. Infoline anticipates misdirected calls, yet has indicated that they are prepared to work closely with cell phone providers to work out these problems. Connecticut's Infoline also plans to expand database resources to include service programs offered in border towns just outside the state of Connecticut in hopes of mitigating potential problems encountered when a wireless caller from outside the state accesses 211.

In these cases, with the exception of Minnesota, wireless routing issues are rendered somewhat less complex because these 211 service providers operate single call centers providing centralized services for their locations. A single point-to number is utilized, and therefore the programming of MSCs, similar to that of central offices, is made more direct.

First Call Minnesota provided Qwest with geographic regions where calls should be routed. In this case, First Call Minnesota has ten call center hubs. Qwest agreed to route calls based on the caller's current location, rather than the caller's billing address.

In locations which promise to contain multiple call centers serving adjacent geographic regions, routing issues predictably become considerably more complex. Even in the cases outlined above, some mis-direction of wireless calls is anticipated. For locations in which multiple call centers are planned, the development of broadened database resources *and* the development of telephone infrastructure between call centers will be crucial for successful wireless access to 211. If a wireless call should be "misdirected" to a distant call center, that call center should have the capability either to provide I&R services to the caller, or (preferably) to "transparently" direct the call to the appropriate center. In a fully-integrated 211 system, these capabilities are readily available. Alternately, an integrated 211 system may have the capability to specify a single "point-to" number for statewide 211 calls. In this instance, a wireless network would be more easily programmed to route 211 calls to the landline-based 211 network or WAN, which would then be routed appropriately.

### ***State Commission Support***

Support received by present and potential 211 providers from their state's public utilities bodies can aid rapid and efficient 211 implementation more than almost any other factor. The FCC 211 ruling does not describe or recommend the role to be taken by state commissions with regard to 211 services. From the federal perspective, the specific

role of state commissions is best determined on a case-by-case basis. Some overall trends, however, are discernible. Many PUCs, like LECs, are unfamiliar with the concept of Information and Referral, its requirements, purposes, and importance. In these cases, it falls to the I&R community to proactively educate appropriate PUC representatives to gain support.

Several states' PUCs have taken particularly active roles in 211 implementation. In many cases, these states' 211 service provider(s) or development leader(s) had received PUC approval for use of the 211 dialing code for I&R delivery *prior* to the FCC 211 rule. State commissions that have followed this pattern include Connecticut, Georgia, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Texas, and Utah. Other state commissions have chosen to take an active role regardless of the authority specifically delegated to them from the FCC rule. Implementation efforts in these locations have generally benefited from such involvement, and have experienced more rapid and smooth development of 211. Examples of states in which utilities commissions have clearly aided 211 implementation by taking a strong role include Colorado, Indiana, and Oregon.

As the FCC rule is generally interpreted as providing no particular regulatory authority to individual PUCs, other commissions have opted for a "hands-off" approach. In these cases, I&Rs often struggle in negotiations with LECs that have been given little motivation to actively pursue 211 implementation and little means to judge between different groups attempting to provide 211 service. Between these two approaches falls explicit PUC support of qualified 211 implementation organizations. Such recognition can aid LECs in determining which 211 organizations are the most appropriate negotiation targets, and can provide impetus for timely and active negotiations. While it is not legally necessary for 211 providers to approach PUCs (they are free to negotiate service contracts directly with LECs), PUC involvement is clearly beneficial.

### ***State Legislation***

A helpful adjunct to active utilities commission involvement in 211 implementation can be the passage of legislation governing 211-oriented organizations or appropriating state funding for 211 development. Particularly in the early stages of 211 development, legislation which establishes the use of 211 dialing codes for Information and Referral and which outlines and describes the nature of future 211 services can aid in further legitimizing implementation efforts and demonstrating the "support of the people" for the number's use. Further, if legislation can establish a collaborative group or committee (or officially "approve" an existing collaborative group), a much broader collaborative base is generally created, drawing representatives from all key areas of 211 implementation. Finally, if legislation can be written to include funding appropriations for the establishment of 211 services and/or the costs of 211 operations, 211 service providers can obviously benefit from a steady annual revenue stream.

Pursuing state legislation, while often difficult and slow to come to fruition, is a growing trend among both hopeful and operational 211 service providers. Such legislation, when successful, can provide the most stable political ground for the continued pursuit of 211 development. As such, states which have passed legislation and/or resolutions specifically concerning 211 services include Delaware, Michigan, New Hampshire, Texas, and West Virginia. Other states which have specifically pursued legislation which has not been passed include Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Washington.

### ***Federal Legislation***

Beyond state-based legislation, legislation pursued or passed at the federal level involving 2-1-1 can carry clear benefits for state- or locally-based implementation efforts. A twofold purpose is served by such legislation. The first benefit gleaned from the passage of federal 2-1-1 legislation, predictably, is that of considerable funding appropriations which can aid in easing the almost universal financial burdens faced by social service and I&R services. Almost more importantly, federal 2-1-1 legislation places issues of 2-1-1 implementation within a national forum of discussion, thereby creating both a higher profile for implementation projects and a precedent for the continued presence of 2-1-1 as a viable issue.

On October 11, 2001, Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton (D-NY), Senator Christopher Dodd (D-CT), and Congresswoman Louise Slaughter (D-NY) introduced legislation, ““Protecting America’s Children Against Terrorism Act” (S.1539) which included language to authorize funding of 2-1-1 implementation and development. Key elements of this bill, including specific language authorizing funding for 2-1-1 were moved to “The Bioterrorism Preparedness Act,” (S.1765) introduced on December 4, 2001, by Senator Bill Frist (R-TN). This legislation (S.1765) would, among other provisions, create a \$667 million State Bioterrorism and Response Block Grant to help fund the development of anti-bioterrorism and bioterrorism response programs nationwide. On June 12, 2001, President Bush signed the final version of this bill, the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002 (PL 107-188), which authorized a state block grant and specifically mentions 2-1-1 as an allowable use of funds. Since then, the Senate Labor-Health and Human Services-Education (Labor-H) Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee has reported legislation that funds the “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund.” This allocation provides funding to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) for upgrading state and local bioterrorism preparedness and response capacity at \$940 million – the same amount appropriated in last year’s emergency bioterrorism supplemental. As of this publication (August, 2002), it is anticipated that the House will pursue a similar course of action. This means that the Senate did not fund the authorizing legislation of the “Public Health and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act” (PL 107-188), which specifically mentioned 2-1-1 as an allowable use of funds. However, funding for 2-1-1 remains likely, as preparing a “plan for risk communication and information dissemination” remains a critical benchmark for states preparing their bioterrorism preparedness plans and states have no constraints in building these plans.

Current information on the progress of national legislation impacting 211 efforts can be found at [www.211.org](http://www.211.org).

### **Conclusions**

This report has assessed efforts across the United States to implement 211-accessed Information and Referral services. While the information here is not comprehensive in terms of all areas currently initiating 211 service, it provides a useful portrait of the trends shaping 211 implementation and the issues facing the organizations involved.

The trajectories and issues described here can serve 211 organizations at various implementation points by providing examples of effective strategies and approaches

utilized in other areas. For established 211 organizations, whether currently operating 211 services or close to doing so, this information can familiarize them with other efforts as well as provide ideas for system expansion and technical enhancements. These data can help to educate telephone company representatives about the basic function of I&R services and the technical necessities of an operational 211 system. State utilities bodies may use this information to similar ends as well as to understand what actions equivalent organizations in other states have chosen to take with regard to 211 implementation. In particular, the role that utility commissions can play, the issue of obtaining cost estimates and system designs from telecommunications providers, working out strategies and jurisdictional issues with local and regional I&R providers, and assembling a comprehensive business plan are all fundamental factors that appear to be important in launching 211 services. Federal bodies, both regulatory and legislative, can use this information to familiarize themselves with the scope and breadth of 211 efforts and to shape policy concerning 211 development.

Further research must be conducted as 211 efforts unfold. Strategies will change and new trends will emerge in accordance with the establishment of more numerous 211 systems and with technical developments in telecommunications and I&R services. Eventually, a truly nationwide, 211-accessed, I&R network will become available. The efforts detailed here offer distinct pieces of that vision and represent integral parts of its realization.

## **Appendix A: 211 Implementation – State By State**

This section presents findings from research conducted by the Telecommunication and Information Policy Institute, University of Texas at Austin, from January-May, 2001, July-August, 2001, and January-February, 2002, and August 2002. The bulk of the data shown here were compiled via a combination of telephone interviews with representatives from 211 providers and implementation groups and research of Internet publications.

As 211 implementation is an ongoing process, so too it encompasses a constantly changing set of data. Data reflected in this report should not be taken as the ultimate characterization of the nature or state of 211 implementation efforts. Many of the efforts described here have progressed considerably since data were collected. Rather, these data are a reflection of the best available information regarding the “state of affairs” of 211 implementation in each location at the time that individuals were contacted. Nor is the list of 211 implementation efforts in this report necessarily comprehensive. We know that 211 implementation efforts do exist in locations not covered in this report, but information was unavailable at the time this report was researched and compiled.

Included below is an example and description of the data fields used throughout this appendix. As well, in locations currently providing operational 211 services in a state via multiple call centers, each operational (or soon to be operational) call center is given a separate entry. In these cases (which include Florida and Georgia), a separate overview of the statewide effort is provided.



## EXAMPLE – DATA DESCRIPTION

<b>State</b>	State in which 211 project is located (more specific geographic areas, when necessary, are placed in parentheses).
<b>Company/Project</b>	The primary group(s), or project(s) under which 211 is being developed. Often, these will be the 211 service provider.
<b>Development Leaders</b>	At times, other “lead agencies” will be involved beyond the actual 211 provider. These groups are described here.
<b>Utilities Commission</b>	The involvement, if any, of the state’s utilities regulatory body in 211 implementation.
<b>Legislation</b>	Any legislation concerning 211 implementation (approved or not), whether establishing a collaborative body, recognizing a previously-existing collaborative body, or appropriating funding for 211 development or operating budgets.
<b>System Design</b>	Proposed or established plans for the overall design of a 211 system. <b>Note: Some locations are described as following a “Centralized” design even while there are several call centers in a state. This is due to there being very few locations in which an integrated, statewide 211 system is yet available. Thus, given the context of a single call center serving a single geographic area, “Centralized” design is the most appropriate description. When locations with several call centers provide (or plan to provide) integrated, statewide 211 coverage, one of the “Decentralized” models is utilized for purposes of this report.</b>
<b>Databases</b>	Currently-existing database resources used by operational or proposed 211 call centers. Plans and proposals for database development, particularly with regard to the development of statewide databases and the sharing of databases between multiple call centers is also included.
<b>Notes - Project</b>	Information regarding collaborative groups, organization, funding, areas and populations served, operational and proposed 211 call centers, call volume, etc.
<b>Major Issues – Project</b>	Major issues and obstacles faced in 211 implementation, with particular reference to inter- or intra-organizational concerns or opposition encountered on the part of the organization or project involved in 211 implementation. Potential solutions to these issues are included when available.
<b>LEC Involvement</b>	Telephone companies (Local Exchange Carriers) involved (or likely to be involved) in 211 implementation.
<b>Tariff</b>	Effective and proposed tariff documents providing pricing for 211 (in some cases more generalized N11) services.
<b>Rate Structure</b>	The overall rate structure for 211 service (flat-rate per call, per minute, per central office, etc.).
<b>Setup Costs</b>	Costs incurred by a 211 service provider (potential or operational) for establishment of 211 service capabilities. Usually, these costs are determined either per central office or per basic local calling area.
<b>Maintenance Costs</b>	Specific costs, if any, incurred for ongoing 211 services.
<b>Notes - LEC</b>	Particular information regarding telephone company negotiations, involvement with 211

implementation, technical issues, etc.

**Major Issues – LEC**

Issues and obstacles expressed by LECs with regard to 211 implementation or by 211 service providers (potential and operational) with regard to LEC relationships or negotiations.

**Wireless Development**

Progress made in providing wireless telephone access to 211 services.

**State**

Alabama

**Company/Project**

United Ways of Alabama / Volunteer Information Center (VIC)

**Development Leaders**  
Alabama, etc.

Volunteer Information Center, Montgomery Area United Way (MAUW), United Ways of

**Utilities Commission**

The Alabama Public Service Commission (PSC) played an important role in dealing with LECs. In Summer, 2001, PSC granted the application submitted by United Ways of Alabama for designation as the lead group pursuing statewide 211 implementation.

**Legislation**

No specific legislation has yet been pursued, though the Governor has expressed interest in 211 development and wants to work on receiving eventual legislative funding.

**System Design**

- Decentralized. Eight service regions have been determined, based on the Local Access Transport Areas (LATAs) utilized by telecommunications providers. The regions are as follows: Northwest (with eight counties), Northeast (with five counties), West-Central (with seven counties), Central (with ten counties), East-Central (with eight counties), South-Central (with eight counties), Southwest (with ten counties), and Southeast (with nine counties).
- The 211 call center is operated by VIC and provides 24-hour services (for the first three to six months of operation) via the use of laptop computers and cellular telephones. After-hours 211 callers are directed to dial VIC's cellular number, which places the caller in contact with a trained 211 representative who is then able to access database resources via the laptop computer. Stipend volunteers primarily from area colleges are used to staff phones on nights and weekends. This organization allows VIC initially to forego much of the expense of providing dedicated call center staff for low-volume, off-hours periods. After the initial phase-in period, 24-hour service is provided from the VIC call center.

**Databases**

- VIC currently utilizes an IRis database containing entries for approximately 800 agencies and 1,300 programs. VIC plans eventually to make this database accessible via the World Wide Web.
- Plans for a comprehensive statewide database are being pursued.

**Notes - Project**

- The Volunteer Information Center (VIC) began operation in March, 1974 (then under the name Volunteer Action Center) to provide volunteer placement and training services to the Montgomery community. VIC began offering I&R services in 1985, providing service for a population of approximately 300,000 in a three-county area. VIC receives approximately 1,000 calls per month specifically for its I&R service (other services include a "clearinghouse" for financial assistance providers, and communication services between service providers). VIC's I&R call center employs three full-time and two part-time staff and will become operational under 211 in Fall, 2001.
- VIC partnered with MAUW in an effort to provide statewide 211 service to Alabama. A Steering Committee will be formed to assist in statewide implementation, with representatives from the Governor's Office, United Ways of Alabama, BellSouth, Alabama Public Service Commission, and others.

**LEC Involvement**

BellSouth

**Tariff**

A BellSouth tariff specifically designed for 211 services was approved by PSC.

<b>Rate Structure</b>	After initial service establishment fees, no Monthly Recurring Charge or other ongoing fees are indicated.
<b>Setup Costs</b>	A tariffed service establishment charge of \$389.90 per Basic Local Calling Area plus central office activation fees of \$150.00 per central office will be incurred by 211 service providers.
<b>Maintenance Costs</b>	No ongoing costs are indicated.
<b>Notes - LEC</b>	VIC representatives have indicated that they have been disappointed with BellSouth in 211 negotiations and would recommend that other I&R agencies find alternative LECs to work with.
<b>Wireless Development</b>	Due to the relatively early stage of 211 development in Alabama, no specific information on wireless implementation issues is available.
<b>Source(s)</b>	<p>Camilla Prince, Information and Referral Coordinator – Volunteer Information Center [phone interview 8/23/01] [updated 7/29/02]</p> <p>BellSouth - Alabama, "General Subscriber Services Tariff - A13.79 211 Dialing Service", effective January 15, 2001. &lt;<a href="http://www.bellsouth.com/tariffs">http://www.bellsouth.com/tariffs</a>&gt;</p>

<b>State</b>	<b>Alaska</b>
<b>Company/Project</b>	United Ways of Alaska
<b>Development Leaders</b>	United Ways of Alaska
<b>Utilities Commission</b>	Initial contact has been made with the Alaska Public Utilities Commission about 211 implementation.
<b>Legislation</b>	No specific legislation has yet been pursued.
<b>System Design</b>	While the system design is to be determined, United Way of Anchorage anticipates a centralized system design with multiple call centers.
<b>Databases</b>	Through a partnership with the State of Alaska and the United Way of Anchorage, AK info, a statewide internet-based database was developed. This database is accessible to I&R agencies. There is also a statewide 800 number that is accessible 24 hours a day, seven days a week.
<b>Notes - Project</b>	Preliminary discussions are planned with state officials regarding the appropriation of bioterrorism funds.
<b>Major Issue-Project</b>	Alaska is a large geographic area with small isolated communities
<b>LEC Involvement</b>	
<b>Tariff</b>	Unknown
<b>Rate Structure</b>	Unknown
<b>Setup Costs</b>	Unknown
<b>Maintenance Costs</b>	Unknown
<b>Notes - LEC</b>	There are several small LECs that serve Alaska.
<b>Wireless Development</b>	Due to the relatively early stage of 211 development in Alaska, no specific information on wireless implementation issues is available.
<b>Source(s)</b>	Fred Jenkins, Executive Vice President, United Way of Anchorage [phone interview 7/29/02] <a href="http://www.ak.org">www.ak.org</a>

<b>Rate Structure</b>	After initial service establishment fees, no Monthly Recurring Charge or other ongoing fees are indicated.
<b>Setup Costs</b>	A tariffed service establishment charge of \$389.90 per Basic Local Calling Area plus central office activation fees of \$150.00 per central office will be incurred by 211 service providers.
<b>Maintenance Costs</b>	No ongoing costs are indicated.
<b>Notes - LEC</b>	VIC representatives have indicated that they have been disappointed with BellSouth in 211 negotiations and would recommend that other I&R agencies find alternative LECs to work with.
<b>Wireless Development</b>	Due to the relatively early stage of 211 development in Alabama, no specific information on wireless implementation issues is available.
<b>Source(s)</b>	<p>Camilla Prince, Information and Referral Coordinator – Volunteer Information Center [phone interview 8/23/01] [updated 7/29/02]</p> <p>BellSouth - Alabama, "General Subscriber Services Tariff - A13.79 211 Dialing Service", effective January 15, 2001. &lt;<a href="http://www.bellsouth.com/tariffs">http://www.bellsouth.com/tariffs</a>&gt;</p>

<b>State</b>	Alaska
<b>Company/Project</b>	United Ways of Alaska
<b>Development Leaders</b>	United Ways of Alaska
<b>Utilities Commission</b>	Initial contact has been made with the Alaska Public Utilities Commission about 211 implementation.
<b>Legislation</b>	No specific legislation has yet been pursued.
<b>System Design</b>	While the system design is to be determined, United Way of Anchorage anticipates a centralized system design with multiple call centers.
<b>Databases</b>	Through a partnership with the State of Alaska and the United Way of Anchorage, AK info, a statewide internet-based database was developed. This database is accessible to I&R agencies. There is also a statewide 800 number that is accessible 24 hours a day, seven days a week.
<b>Notes - Project</b>	Preliminary discussions are planned with state officials regarding the appropriation of bioterrorism funds.
<b>Major Issue-Project</b>	Alaska is a large geographic area with small isolated communities
<b>LEC Involvement</b>	
<b>Tariff</b>	Unknown
<b>Rate Structure</b>	Unknown
<b>Setup Costs</b>	Unknown
<b>Maintenance Costs</b>	Unknown
<b>Notes - LEC</b>	There are several small LECs that serve Alaska.
<b>Wireless Development</b>	Due to the relatively early stage of 211 development in Alaska, no specific information on wireless implementation issues is available.
<b>Source(s)</b>	Fred Jenkins, Executive Vice President, United Way of Anchorage [phone interview 7/29/02] <a href="http://www.ak.org">www.ak.org</a>

<b>State</b>	Arizona
<b>Company/Project</b>	Community Information & Referral Service (CIRS)
<b>Development Leaders</b>	United Way of Arizona, Community Information and Referral Service, Inc., etc.
<b>Utilities Commission</b>	The Arizona Public Utilities Commission has indicated that it intends to facilitate relations between 211 providers and LECs. Few specific steps have yet been taken.
<b>System Design</b>	No specific system design has yet been determined. The centralized model (single call center under centralized administration) seems the likeliest strategy, as it would utilize currently available call center resources.
<b>Databases</b>	CIRS currently utilizes a self-designed database containing information on 9,000 service programs offered by 2,500 agencies. It seems likely that existing database facilities would be retained in 211 implementation.
<b>Notes - Project</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CIRS is an independent, not-for-profit, 24-hour, comprehensive, multi-county information and referral service established in 1964. CIRS is based in Phoenix and provides I&amp;R services for 10 of Arizona's 15 counties (the remaining 5 counties are serviced by an I&amp;R provider in Tucson). CIRS received 177,606 inquiries in 2000.</li> <li>- Currently, plans are underway for the formation of a collaborative body that will work toward 211 implementation. To date, one meeting has been held among the "key players" in the process - CIRS, United Way, the Governor's office, 911 representatives, police bodies, etc. - and a feasibility study is planned for 211 implementation.</li> </ul>
<b>Major Issues - Project</b>	The greatest issue expressed by CIRS representatives is the considerable cost likely faced in 211 implementation, both in LEC involvement (central office programming, monthly recurring charges, etc.), and in potentially increased staffing requirements to meet projected increases in I&R inquiries. A need for information regarding recommended avenues and strategies for funding has been expressed.
<b>LEC Involvement</b>	Qwest
<b>Tariff</b>	None yet proposed.
<b>Rate Structure</b>	Unknown.
<b>Setup Costs</b>	Unknown.
<b>Maintenance Costs</b>	Unknown.
<b>Notes - LEC</b>	Due to the relatively early development level of 211 implementation in Arizona, substantial relationships with LECs have not yet been created. No specific information on costs is available.
<b>Source(s)</b>	<p>Rita Weatherholt, Information &amp; Referral Services, Inc. [updated 7/23/02]</p> <p>Roberto Armijo, Community Information &amp; Referral [phone interview 2/22/01] [updated 4/30/01] [updated 8/13/01]</p>

<b>State</b>	<b>Arkansas</b>
<b>Company/Project</b>	Arkansas Department of Human Services (ADHS)
<b>Development Leaders</b>	None.
<b>Utilities Commission</b>	No involvement.
<b>Legislation</b>	None.
<b>System Design</b>	None.
<b>Databases</b>	None.
<b>Notes - Project</b>	ADHS representatives have indicated that, while some consultation regarding 211 implementation was undertaken in 2000, no activity currently exists for the state.
<b>Major Issues - Project</b>	
<b>LEC Involvement</b>	None.
<b>Tariff</b>	None.
<b>Rate Structure</b>	None.
<b>Setup Costs</b>	None.
<b>Maintenance Costs</b>	None.
<b>Notes - LEC</b>	No 211 activity.
<b>Major Issue - LEC</b>	
<b>Wireless Development</b>	
<b>Source(s)</b>	Joe Quin - Arkansas Department of Human Services [phone interview 6/26/01]



<b>State</b>	California
<b>Company/Project</b>	California 211 Steering Committee / CAIRS 211 Workgroup
<b>Development Leaders</b>	CAIRS 211 Workgroup, California 211 Steering Committee, etc.
<b>Utilities Commission</b>	On January 23, 2002, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) opened Rulemaking in response to a petition filed by CAIRS and the Steering Committee to provide regulatory assistance in LEC service negotiations and in technical standards provision for 211 service providers. The petition is divided into two major areas: the first consists of arguments for active PUC involvement in 211 implementation and requests that CPUC provide an official 211 assignment order while the second consists of recommendations for the actual language that is to be issued by CPUC concerning 211 should the Commission opt for involvement. This language will provide a basis for rules and standards to be applied to potential 211 service providers.
<b>Legislation</b>	The project elected to pursue regulatory action via CPUC rather than legislative support.
<b>System Design</b>	<p>- Decentralized. Current preferences expressed by the Steering Committee consist of an implementation strategy closely resembling that of the Ohio 211 Collaborative. This plan calls for implementation of 211 service on a county-by-county basis. Each 211 provider will operate on a county scope, with some providing services for surrounding counties as well. Those county-based agencies with specialized, non-comprehensive I&amp;R capability will take steps to ensure more comprehensive coverage. 24-hour service is a requirement which may be met either by the 2-1-1 service provider itself or by contracting another qualified agency to handle after-hours calls.</p> <p>- Distinct from the implementation plans expressed in Ohio, some form of cooperative call routing is envisioned. This could be accomplished either through Regional Technical Centers (RTCs) or contracting for call-handling through a carrier's advanced routing service. Either method could offer natural language recognition (for menuing purposes which allow a caller to navigate through the initial stages of an inquiry), that many small I&amp;R providers find financially prohibitive to pursue.</p>
<b>Databases</b>	Database facilities will be maintained individually by 211 call centers. Compatibility standards will be considered for call centers that are to roll-over to larger call centers for 211 service. Currently, no plans are explicitly made for the creation of a statewide database but there is some support for going in that direction.
<b>Notes - Project</b>	<p>- The California Alliance of Information and Referral Services (CAIRS) helped to form the 211 Steering Committee in late 2000. CAIRS prefers that some form of statewide oversight is provided, either by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) or by a specific 211-oriented body as determined in agreement with CPUC and the Steering Committee. Such oversight will help to provide standardization in service and can help to mitigate potential disputes between "competing" I&amp;Rs wishing to provide 211 services in a given area.</p> <p>- The CAIRS 211 Workgroup received a grant of \$531,700 from the California Endowment for the purposes of planning and demonstration. A grant of \$125,000 from the Community Technology Foundation of California is supporting technical consulting, some staff services, and some hardware purchases. A grant of \$9,931 from the Julius Sumner Miller Foundation is supporting translation of outreach materials into 14 languages and production of some materials. Additional proposals have been submitted. CAIRS individual and agency members have contributed approximately \$8,000, including over \$300,000 in cash and in-kind donations has been received from INFOLINE of Los Angeles.</p>
<b>Major Issues - Project</b>	Some smaller I&R agencies find it difficult or impossible to achieve AIRS accreditation, primarily because of the expense. Therefore, full accreditation is not a suggested standard

in the Steering Committee's petition to the CPUC. Adherence to the AIRS National Standards for 211Centers [see **Appendix D**] is, however, included in the petition.

<b>LEC Involvement</b>	Discussions have been held with SBC/PacBell and Verizon. SBC has designed and tested the switching technology it will use for 211 services (the same technology will be deployed for use by a 511 calling service).
<b>Tariff</b>	SBC had initially said it planned to submit a tariff to 211 service in California and Verizon has said it plans to negotiate Individual Basis Contracts (IBCs). SBC now says it may choose to use IBCs also.
<b>Rate Structure</b>	Unknown.
<b>Setup Costs</b>	Unknown.
<b>Maintenance Costs</b>	Unknown.
<b>Notes - LEC</b>	Due to the relatively early stage of 211 development in California, no official information on LEC costs is yet available. California 211 is monitoring negotiations elsewhere in the country.
<b>Major Issue - LEC</b>	None indicated.
<b>Wireless Development</b>	Due to the relatively early stage of 211 development in California, no specific information on wireless implementation issues is available.
<b>Source(s)</b>	Burt Wallrich, California 211 Project Coordinator [phone interview 4/18/01] [updated 7/23/01] [updated 1/18/02] [updated 7/8/02] < <a href="http://www.infoline-la.org">http://www.infoline-la.org</a> >

<b>State</b>	Colorado
<b>Company/Project</b>	FirstCall / Mile High United Way / Colorado 211 Steering Committee
<b>Development Leaders</b>	FirstCall (Fort Collins), Mile High United Way (Denver), 211 Colorado Steering Committee
<b>Utilities Commission</b>	The Colorado Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has taken an active, supportive stance with regard to 211 implementation. CPUC administers and approves petitions for 211 service, and maintains a detailed set of standards which must be met by 211 service providers: statewide coverage must be planned, the 211 system must have an active governing body, a "rollout plan" must be provided (see "Notes - Project" for details of this plan), a marketing plan must be in place, etc.. The PUC has requested the Colorado 211 Steering Committee submit their petition at the end of August 2002.
<b>Legislation</b>	No legislation is currently pursued, though this may be an option in the future (particularly with regard to funding issues).
<b>System Design</b>	Decentralized. Approximately seven call centers will provide statewide 211 coverage. When fully implemented (see "Notes - Project" for details), each call center will provide 24-hour service in its respective area and will receive assistance and oversight from a governing board to be formed in the future.
<b>Databases</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FirstCall, Mile High United Way and Weld County United Way all utilize the IRis database. Mesa County Health and Human Services utilizes a custom program similar to IRis. The four databases combined cover approximately 5,500 programs and services</li> <li>- Upon 211 implementation, I&amp;R databases will likely be shared between 211 call centers via the World Wide Web.</li> </ul>
<b>Notes - Project</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Colorado 211 Steering Committee was formed in February, 2001 and consists of representatives from approximately 40 organizations (both comprehensive and specialized I&amp;Rs, United Ways, CPUC, Qwest, etc.</li> <li>- Among the four comprehensive I&amp;Rs in Colorado in 2001, approximately 25,000 calls were received</li> <li>- A multi-phase implementation plan has been designed. In the pilot phase (scheduled to begin December 1, 2002), the four major comprehensive I&amp;R call centers which exist in Colorado - FirstCall (Fort Collins), Mile High United Way (Denver), Weld County United Way HelpLine (Greeley), Mesa County Health and Human Services (Grand Junction) - "Group One", will provide 211 services for the jurisdictions that they currently cover. Simultaneously, the three remaining likely call centers - located in Colorado Springs, Durango, and Pueblo - "Group Two" will develop their respective resources in preparation of offering 211 service the following year. The second phase of 211 implementation (scheduled for December 1, 2003) consists of Group One call centers expanding database resources to cover counties in areas adjacent to those already covered. Simultaneously, Group Two call centers will become operational. The third phase (scheduled for December 1, 2004) consists of the expansion of database resources (and thereby coverage area) for Group Two call centers. By December 1, 2005, it is hoped that statewide 211 coverage will be available.</li> </ul>
<b>Major Issues - Project</b>	
<b>LEC Involvement</b>	Qwest

<b>Tariff</b>	Qwest included N11 services in its service catalog in June, 2001. This catalog offering required a service establishment charge of \$300.00 per point-to number plus a \$95.00 per central office activation charge. As well, a charge of \$.05 per call routed to 211 would have been incurred. CPUC negotiated revisions to the offering, which was submitted in July, 2001. The revised offering maintains the \$300.00 service establishment charge per point-to number but lowers the central office activation fee to \$30.00 per switch. As well, the per-call rate was lowered to \$.02 (Qwest Corporation; General Subscriber Services Catalog - Colorado, Exchange and Network Services, Section 10.11.3, "N11 Service", effective July 30, 2001, < <a href="http://www.qwest.com">http://www.qwest.com</a> >).
<b>Rate Structure</b>	Following service establishment and central office programming costs, a per-call charge will be incurred (see "Tariff" for more information).
<b>Setup Costs</b>	Catalog service establishment charges of \$300.00 per point-to number and \$30.00 per central office activation. Under this N11 offering, a total cost of approximately \$1,500.00 would be incurred for statewide central office programming in Colorado.
<b>Maintenance Costs</b>	A catalog charge of \$.02 will be incurred per call.
<b>Notes - LEC</b>	LEC negotiations have largely been carried out by CPUC on behalf of the Colorado 211 Steering Committee.
<b>Major Issues - LEC</b>	Qwest has recently filed a lawsuit in District Court protesting CPUC jurisdiction over the 211 Service. While the PUC can assign the number to the Colorado 2-1-1 Steering Committee, a judge now will need to decide whether the CPUC is able to make rules about LEC compliance on implementation.
<b>Wireless Development</b>	Though wireless access to 211 is a consideration, no substantial negotiations have yet been pursued.
<b>Source(s)</b>	Mary Robertson - FirstCall [phone interview 7/26/01] [updated 7/28/02]  Qwest Corporation - Colorado, Exchange and Network Services Catalog, Section 10.11.3, "N11 Service", effective July 30, 2001, < <a href="http://www.qwest.com">http://www.qwest.com</a> >

<b>State</b>	Connecticut
<b>Company/Project</b>	United Way of Connecticut / Infoline
<b>Development Leaders</b>	United Way of Connecticut
<b>Utilities Commission</b>	The Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control (CDPUC) provides guidance and oversight regarding access issues. For example, cellular access to 211, while not currently available, is being pursued via CDPUC via development requests sent to cellular service providers.
<b>System Design</b>	Centralized: a single call center provides statewide 211 services with regional "community specialists" to provide "local presence". The InfoLine call center uses a Lucent Definity switching system for intra-call center routing.
<b>Databases</b>	Call center utilizes Refer SQL, a server-based database including approximately 4,300 agencies and 40,000 services. Infoline uses 5 full-time employees for database maintenance, updates, and research (carried out on a continual basis). Sources for updates include surveys, printed materials (newspapers, newsletters, annual reports, etc.), information gathered by community specialists, information gathered from regular contact with agencies, feedback from follow-up (15% of all received calls), etc.
<b>Notes - Project</b>	Infoline was created in the mid-1970s as a comprehensive I&R service on a statewide, toll-free basis. No other comprehensive I&R services exist in Connecticut, and the transition to 211 capability made use of existing databases and call center facilities. United Way is the primary agency administering Infoline, though other agencies contribute financial resources on a partnership basis. Infoline serves a population of approximately 3.4 million, and handled approximately 258,357 transactions in the year 2001 (the total referral transactions from all call centers was 313,993 in 2001).
<b>Major Issues - Project</b>	No major obstacles in 211 implementation have been indicated.
<b>LEC Involvement</b>	Southern New England Telephone (SBC)
<b>Tariff</b>	None yet proposed.
<b>Rate Structure</b>	Per minute: \$.06 per minute, billed in 18 second increments (rates are the same as previous system - see project notes)
<b>Setup Costs</b>	Approximately \$9,000.00 to switch extant system to 211 capability (see "Notes-Project").
<b>Maintenance Costs</b>	No MRC is incurred for maintenance of central offices in 211-to-toll-free translation. The 211 call center utilizes three T1 circuits which incur monthly fees (currently approximately \$1,100.00 per circuit).
<b>Notes - LEC</b>	
<b>Major Issues - LEC</b>	No major obstacles with regard to LECs are indicated.
<b>Wireless Development</b>	- The centralized/single call center model implemented in Connecticut creates relatively simple conditions for wireless translation to 211. Because only one

office, and therefore only one toll-free "point-to" number is utilized, the mobile switches (MSCs) used in wireless telecommunications only need to be programmed for that number. Problems nevertheless occur, as the coverage areas for wireless communications do not closely follow political boundaries such as state borders. Some 211 calls from outside Connecticut could therefore conceivably be "misdirected" to Connecticut's Infoline. United Way of Connecticut/Infoline testified at a CDPUC hearing that it is aware of the cross-border routing issues and is implementing procedures designed to mitigate potential problems (for example, the expansion of I&R databases to include agencies in neighboring areas).

- "United Way of Connecticut requested [in a letter dated January 18, 2001] that the CDPUC modify its Decision dated December 2, 1998 and order all Connecticut wireless telecommunications providers to provide an abbreviated 211 dialing code for their subscribers to access...(Infoline). In that Decision, the CDPUC recognized that wireless telecommunication service providers experienced technical difficulties in completing (211) calls...and expected that those issues would be resolved by the FCC, North American Numbering Council, and the wireless industry. Subsequently, CDPUC exempted the wireless industry from implementing the abbreviated 211 dialing code until such time as those issues were resolved. CDPUC reopened the...docket for the limited purpose of addressing United Way's letter... On May 1, 2001, CDPUC released a Draft Decision...(requiring) wireless carriers to implement 211 abbreviated dialing by August 1, 2001."

\* - excerpted from e-mail correspondence submitted by Mary Hogan - United Way of Connecticut; 7/18/01

- Several wireless carriers in Connecticut responded to the Draft Decision, mainly stating that wireless access to 211 would be feasible within timeframes ranging from ninety days (Springwich/Cingular Wireless) to six months after CDPUC mandate (AT&T Wireless Services). Sprint PCS, while not providing a specific timeframe for wireless implementation, "...anticipates no problems with with updating its Connecticut mobile switches (MSCs) to translate and route 211 calls from Sprint PCS's customers to the toll-free number provided by (Infoline)."

\* - excerpted from Sprint PCS correspondence received by CDPUC; June 28, 2001 [submitted by Mary Hogan; July 21, 2001].

- AT&T Wireless Services (AWS) made provisions for the development of a wireless service agreement to be filed with CDPUC, outlining some of the potential difficulties in wireless 211 implementation (cross-border issues) but stating that the AWS wireless network in Connecticut was capable of 211 programming. Representatives from Nextel Wireless indicated that the AWS Agreement would likely be used as the basis for Nextel providing 211 access to United Way / Infoline.

-As of July 2002, wireless access to 211 is available to customers of Sprint PCS and AT&T

#### **Source(s)**

Mary Hogan - Vice President for Information and Special Initiatives [phone interview 1/24/01] [updated 4/5/01] [updated 7/19/01] [updated 7/28/02]